



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,363	03/26/2004	Toshiharu Takemura	250822US6	7563

22850 7590 06/09/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KIM, DANIEL Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2185

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,363

Applicant(s)

TAKEMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Kim

Art Unit

2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statement(s) received August 9, 2004 and May 1, 2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the Information Disclosure Statement(s) is being considered by the examiner.

Where the provided translation of a foreign patent publication was limited to the abstract, only the abstract has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1- 2, 4, 7-8 and 10 are rejected under under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Angelo et al (US Patent No. 6,581,162).

For claim 1, Angelo discloses a data communication apparatus comprising:

a memory space (a secure memory space such as system management mode memory, col. 3, lines 3-4);

service defining means for defining, in the memory space, a service and a service memory field to which the service is applied (session keys, passwords, and encryption algorithms are maintained in a secure memory space, col. 3, lines 1-3; information is maintained in a secure memory space, and in addition to a user password or PIN information, optional node identification information is stored in secure memory and is appended to the user password or PIN information, and both are subsequently encrypted by an encryption algorithm and encryption keys that are also stored in secure memory, this allows a network server or other networked resources to identify the particular computer system with which it is communicating and grant access privileges accordingly, col. 3, lines 9-20); and

PIN-code service defining means for defining a PIN-code service which verifies a PIN code before performing the service (computer network resources utilize the user password or PIN information for user verification, col. 6, lines 35-37).

For claim 2, Angelo discloses area defining means for defining an area including one or more service memory fields provided in the memory space (a microprocessor maps a portion of memory referred to as the system management mode memory into the main memory space, and the processor begins executing a handler routine which is an interrupt service routine to perform specific system management tasks such as providing security services, col. 7, lines 61-67, col. 8, lines 1-4).

For claim 4, Angelo discloses overlap-service defining means for defining another service applied to the service memory field which has already been provided by the service defining means (the encryption key data entered by a user is securely stored

for use in multiple encryption processes during a communication session, col. 3, lines 29-31).

Claim 7 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim 8 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 2 above.

Claim 10 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 4 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 5-6, 9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angelo et al (US Patent No. 6,581,162) and Kisliakov (US PGPub No. 20030212895).

For claim 3, Angelo discloses the invention as per rejection of claim 2 above.

Angelo fails to disclose the limitations of the current claim.

Kisliakov, however, helps disclose the PIN-code service defining means defines a PIN-code service which verifies a PIN code before accessing the area (the personal identification number is verified by a verification means associated with the point of access and the user is allowed or denied access to the amenity and/or service depending on the result of the verification process, par. 0005).

Angelo and Kisliakov are analogous art in that they are of the same field of endeavor, that is, a system and/or method of memory management. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include verifying a PIN code before accessing an area because this would help regulate a memory and means to enter and a personal identification number in order to maintain access to amenities and/or services for different users (par. 0005), as taught by Kisliakov.

For claim 5, the combined teachings of Angelo and Kisliakov disclose the invention as per rejection of claim 3 above.

Kisliakov further helps disclose the PIN-code service defining means defines a PIN-code service which verifies a PIN code before performing said overlapped another service (overlapping user interface elements are allowed, and an element object is defined through a data field with a second element object which may overlap the first element object, par. 0216).

Claim 6 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 3 above.

Claim 9 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 3 above.

Claim 11 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 5 above.

Claim 12 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 6 above.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ellison et al (US Patent No. 6,934,817) discloses controlling memory accesses to multiple memory zones in an isolated execution environment, generating access transactions, and granting access if transactions are valid.


Contact Information

7. Any inquiries concerning this action or earlier actions from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Kim, reachable at 571-272-2742, on Mon-Fri from 8:30am-5pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan, is also reachable at 571-272-4210.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information from published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. All questions regarding access to the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC), reachable at 866-217-9197.

DK

6-5-06


PIERRE VITAL
PRIMARY EXAMINER